

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on march 27, 2008

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated March 27, 2008.

By means of the present amendment, independent claim 3 has been amended for better clarity. Accordingly, no new issues requiring a new search have been introduced and entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. No. 6,792,577 (Kimoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,910,068 (Zintel). It is respectfully submitted that 1-3, 5-15 and 17-20 are patentable Kimoto and Zintel for at least the following reasons.

Kimoto is directed to a receiving system capable of storing style sheets separately from XML documents. This alleviates the need to add a style sheet to each XML document body and to transmit it, thus reducing the amount of the data to be transmitted.

On pages 3 and 7 of the Final Office Action, FIG 5 and column 11, lines 54-56 of Kimoto is cited to allegedly show "wherein the specified portion is the document in full when only a name of the

document is included," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 5, 14 and 20. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that FIG 5 and column 11, lines 54-56 of Kimoto merely disclose that "the content transmitted via the broadcast satellite 5 is only the XML document body or only the XSL document in addition to a case in which the XML document and the XSL document are supplied together." (Column 11, lines 54-57)

It is respectfully submitted that such a disclosure in Kimoto of transmitting only the XML document body in no way teaches or suggests the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 5, 14 and 20 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the specified portion is the document in full when only a name of the document is included.

These features are nowhere taught or suggested in Kimoto. Zintel is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Kimoto.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 5, 14 and 20 are allowable, and allowance thereof is

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on march 27, 2008


respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3, 6-13, 15 and 17-19 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, 14 and 20.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on march 27, 2008

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
May 27, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101